

Reviewer Outline

International Journal of Gynecological Cancer

Pedro T. Ramirez, M.D.

Professor

Editor-in-Chief, International Journal of Gynecological Cancer

David M. Gershenson Distinguished Professor in Ovarian Cancer Research

Director of Minimally Invasive Research & Education

Department of Gynecologic Oncology & Reproductive Medicine



Topics of Discussion

- Reasons for becoming a Reviewer
- How to become a Reviewer
- Expectations from the IJGC of its Reviewers
- Metrics on Reviewer performance
- Items to avoid as Reviewer
- Terms from IJGC for Reviewers

Reasons for Becoming a Reviewer

- Scientific obligation
- Helps to assure that the published literature is novel and of high quality
- Reflect on the quality of this journal
- Learning opportunity for Reviewer
- Reciprocates professional courtesy
- Provides an opportunity for professional growth and promotion
- Global responsibility
- Opportunity to become member of Editorial Board

How to Become a Reviewer

- Contact Lindsey Struckmeyer (ijgc@jjeditorial.com)
- Once invited provide the following:
 - Name
 - Institution
 - Updated contact information
 - Choice of preference topics for review
- Consider inviting friends and colleagues

Expectations from Reviewer

- Timely response to accept or decline review
- Once accepting to review a manuscript:
 - Return completed review within 14 days
 - Provide detailed review that clearly outlines questions or comments
 - Provide detailed review specific to the Authors
 - Provide a brief statement to the Editors regarding your decision
- Reviewer should always declare competing interests and decline such reviews
- Decision to accept or reject manuscript

Based on the relevance of data to the literature and/or clinical practice, originality of topic addressed, methods and study design, and language clarity

Metrics Reviewer Performance

- Number of review invitations
- Number of review acceptance vs. decline
- Time from invitation to Reviewer decision
- Time from accepting to review to submission of review to journal
- Quality of comments and questions to authors
- Overall rate of decision rendered
(Accept, Major vs. Minor Revisions, Reject)

Performing a Review

- General Rules on Ethical Aspects
 - Have authors published research before
 - Have authors plagiarized another publication
 - Is the research ethical
 - Has appropriate consent been obtained
 - Is there any indication that data has been fabricated
 - Is there any indication that the data has been manipulated
 - Have authors declared all conflict of interest

Performing a Review

- Express views clearly with supporting arguments and references as necessary
- Provide constructive criticism and an opportunity for the author(s) to provide a response
- Have realistic expectations when requesting additional data or analysis
- Provide specific comments that address gaps or flaws in the study rather than generalized disagreement with the overall principle of the manuscript
- Pose specific questions pertaining to each component of the manuscript (Abstract, Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion)
- Provide very detailed comments to the author(s) with information regarding page and line number
- Base comments on what is the standard of care or general practice in the field rather than your institutional or personal practice

Performing a Review

- **Title Page**

- Assure that title is consistent with the content and findings of the study
- Assure that author designation is appropriate to the field of study

- **Abstract**

- Assure that a clear study objective is provided
- Confirm that information provided is consistent with the methodology, results, and conclusion of the study
- Assure that all numbers and statistical reporting is consistent with those found in the Results
- Confirm that Conclusion is consistent with the data presented and analyzed in the Results

Performing a Review

- **Introduction**

- Background regarding where the field currently stands should be provided
- Clear statement regarding the relevance of the subject presented
- Information as to where the gaps in knowledge lie within that field
- Clear statement outlining the goals and objectives of the study

- **Methods**

- Statement confirming that the study was conducted with IRB approval
- Information on how the data was collected is detailed
- Information on the type of patients evaluated in the study
- Specific details on tools and strategies of how study conducted
- Details on Inclusion and Exclusion criteria
- Adequacy of methods of statistical analysis
- Documentation of consent process
- Registry Number for all prospective trials

Performing a Review

- **Results**

- All data presented in the Results should reflect what was proposed in the Methods

- Details should be provided on total number of patients included in the final analysis and total number of exclusions based on exclusion criteria

- Data should be provided chronologically (demographics, pretreatment, treatment, post-treatment, and outcomes)

- Assure that all numbers and statistical figures match Abstract and Figures & Tables

- Assure that Results only contain data reporting and not interpretation

- Assure that only data that is relevant to the study objective is presented in the Results

- Assure that when Supplementary Tables and Figures are provided, that data is consistent with that reported in the Results

Performing a Review

- **Discussion**

- It should begin with a clear and concise statement summarizing the main finding of the study
- Should not be a repetition of the Results
- Findings should be compared to those of other studies evaluating similar question (when applicable)
- There should be a statement that highlights what is offered by the study that is novel in comparison to published literature
- Statement on how findings are reproducible in other centers should be included
- Provide information on strengths and weaknesses of the study
- A definitive conclusion as to what should be the change in practice or future directions of the field based on findings should be provided

Performing a Review

- **References**

- Assure that majority of references are current
- Confirm that references are of the original study rather than of a secondary publication
- References should not be exhaustive on a particular topic
- Confirm that references are not repetitive
- Confirm that reference numbers from Tables or Figures match those in reference list

Reviewer Decisions

- **Accept**

- No changes required of the authors and manuscript will be accepted exactly as it has been submitted (NOT RECOMMENDED)

- **Minor Revisions**

- Authors have met most of the criteria as mentioned above

- Required information is easily attainable by authors

- Minimal changes required in any or all portions of the manuscript

- Minor edits on language and grammar

Reviewer Decisions

- **Major Revisions**

- Substantial changes required in the manuscript but with consideration for publication provided those changes are addressed by authors
- Major additional information is requested of the authors but within feasibility for the authors
- Requirement for re-analysis of portions or entirety of the data
- Substantial changes to the Discussion requiring a different interpretation of the data to conform to the analysis and presentation of such data
- Significant language or grammatical edits required (*consideration for IJGC Medical Editor*)

Reviewer Decisions

- **Reject**

- Manuscript presents a topic that has been previously published in either a larger cohort of patients or prospective trial with very similar results
- Methodology is inadequate to answer the question proposed
- Results do not reflect or support the proposed methodology or are incongruent with the primary objective
- Interpretation of the data is not supported by the Results of the study
- Data that has been previously published
- Conflict of interest with promotion of drug or product
- Major concerns of plagiarism from prior work
- Grammar and language is not considered appropriate even beyond consideration of edits by Medical Editor

Items to Avoid as Reviewer

- Do not make any statement to the author as to whether the manuscript should be accepted or rejected
- Do not request information that is logistically not possible to obtain based on nature of the study
- Do not make any personal criticism of the author(s)
- Transfer responsibility as a Reviewer to someone else (medical student, residents or fellows) without providing direct supervision and oversight of the review provided by such individual
- Refrain from imparting personal bias onto the review
- Under **no circumstance** should Reviewer make the contents of the manuscript submitted for review public nor discuss unpublished material
- A Reviewer **should never** accept a manuscript for review when there is a clear conflict of interest either in favor or against the data or group submitting the manuscript

Terms from the IJGC

- Identity of the Reviewer will not be revealed to any author
- Reviewers will not be asked (unless in very unique circumstances) to re-review a manuscript once authors have addressed their comments
- Reviewers will not be asked to secure additional Reviewers for a manuscript
- The IJGC will not make public the personal performance ratings (scores) of Reviewers

Resources

COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers

<http://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines>

COPE Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines

<http://publicationethics.org/resources/code-conduct>

Thank you!

Contact Information:

Pedro T Ramirez, MD

Editor-in-Chief

peramire@mdanderson.org

Lindsey Struckmeyer

Managing Editor

ijgc@jjeditorial.com